

### Remarks/Arguments

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action dated March 12, 2004. Claims 1-31 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 being independent.

### Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claims 1-31 because of certain informalities. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11, 12, 14-17, 21, 22, 24-27 and 31 have been amended to incorporate the suggestions offered by the Examiner. The Applicant believes that the Examiner erroneously suggested “sample signals” but meant “signal samples”. In Claims 1, 4-6, 11, 14-16, 21, 24-26 and 31 “signals samples” has been amended to “signal samples”. In Claims 4, 14 and 24 “a plurality of” and “an vector” was amended to read “said plurality of” and “a vector” respectively. In claims 7, 17 and 27 “a block said” was amended to “a block of said”. In claim 31, line 9, the word “and” was deleted.

### Amendment to the Abstract

The abstract has been amended to incorporate the suggestions offered by the Examiner. The amended Abstract does not exceed 150 words in length.

### 35 U.S.C. §112

In the March 12, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 -31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraphs, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that the disclosure lacks support to perform the operation of the method as recited in Claims 1-10 and what are the devices used to operate the apparatus as recited in Claims 11-31.

A typographical error in the Specification at page 7 has been corrected. The specification in its current form describes the detection operation of the receiver. The method as recited in Claims 1-10 is described by a mathematical function and the function is described in the specification. The apparatus as recited in Claims 11-31 is configured to represent the mathematical function described in the specification. Hence no further embodiment of the receiver is needed.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejection of Claims 1-31.

No new matter has been added.

This response attends to each point noted by the Examiner. The claims are proper and patentable. Allowance is respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner deem that further clarification of the record is in order, we invite a telephone call to the Applicant's Attorney to expedite further processing of the application to allowance.

Date: November 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Richard M. Lehrer  
Reg. No. 38, 536  
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky  
& Popeo PC  
The Chrysler Center  
666 Third Avenue, 24<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10017  
Tel. No.: (212) 935-3000  
Fax No.: (212) 983-3115

NYC 306097v1